

Water Resources Organization Study Interest Questionnaire Responses

**Cathy Schaeffer,
Executive Director. Walla Walla Watershed Management Partnership**

1. Name of Your Organization/Entity:
Walla Walla Watershed Management Partnership
2. Members/Who you Serve:
9-member board with representatives from the 'planning area' (the Walla Walla Watershed, WRIA 32) serving stakeholders. The board includes one member each representing:
 - the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
 - City of Walla Walla
 - Columbia County
 - Walla Walla County
 - Gardena Farms Irrigation District #13
 - Conservation Districts (Columbia and Walla Walla County)
 - environmental/conservation groups
 - water users
 - citizens
3. What services you provide:
Local water management including water banking agreements and local water plan development, authorization and oversight in shared governance with Dept of Ecology.
4. Your legal status:
Established under RCW 90.92 for pilot local water management, 2009-2019, as a local public agency.
5. What challenges you have faced/challenges you'd like to see addressed
6. What your entity would like to see accomplished by the study group
7. Other input/ideas you'd like to share with the others at the July 9 meeting

Bob Johnson,
Director of Planning and Community Development, Chehalis River Basin Flood Control Authority

1. Name of Your Organization/Entity
Lewis County Department of Community Development
2. Members/Who you Serve
Lewis County
3. What services you provide
Governmental – likely to be providing some regional water and sewer to south Lewis County and in City of Vader
4. Your legal status
subdivision of the State
5. What challenges you have faced/challenges you'd like to see addressed
 1. **Small towns and rural water/sewer districts are having troubles keeping financially viable. What can we do to help them so they don't fail?**
 2. **To what degree can we provide service to rural areas where appropriate to accomplish our comprehensive plan goals? Are changes to state land use regulations needed?**
 3. **How can we provide the necessary economic development, jobs and revenue necessary to keep counties afloat light of GMA and other restrictions and obstacles?**
 4. **How can we work together to meet the oftentimes diverse and in some cases conflicting goals of our agencies?**
 5. **Infrastructure is failing and is in need of upgrading for health and safety reasons, and to provide service to new development. How can we fund the needed improvements with ever-dwindling resources?**
 6. **Regulations sometimes appear to conflict with stated goals. Example: GMA does not allow sewer systems in rural areas absent a declared health emergency. Rural areas are shown to be major contributors to non-source pollution from septic systems. We are trying to protect groundwater and surface water and fix our salmon habitat. Should we not be encouraging sewer systems in all areas where they are viable to address such issues and clean up the water?**
6. What your entity would like to see accomplished by the study group
Out of the box thinking on how to best provide water and sewer services in a healthful, economic manner and provide our county with some positive help with regards to services that will support growth and economic prosperity. Do we need to try something new and different? Regional water/sewer to serve urban and rural areas where appropriate?
7. Other input/ideas you'd like to share with the others at the July 9 meeting
Our south county subarea plan, including our vision for a regional utility. Also, I see that you are also including flood control...we are trying to work on a multi-county regional flood district. Some legislative fixes may be in order it effectively set up a multi-county flood control zone district.

John Peterson,
General Manager, Clark Regional Wastewater District

1. Name of Your Organization/Entity :
Clark Regional Wastewater District (CRWWD)
2. Members/Who you Serve :
80,000 residents in the urbanized but unincorporated areas of Clark County; close relationships with Clark County and the Cities of Vancouver, Battle Ground, and Ridgefield.
3. What services you provide :
Complete wastewater transmission and treatment services including full engineering, pretreatment, operations, maintenance, customer service, finance and treasury functions. Treatment services are currently contracted through Clark County and the City of Vancouver.
4. Your legal status :
RCW 57 Water-Sewer District
5. What challenges you have faced/challenges you'd like to see addressed :
Recent studies have identified several advantages in providing wastewater services on a regional basis. By consolidating wastewater functions, the economic and environmental needs of the community can be met with lower and more stable rates to the customers. Locally there is a political and management preference for a utility structure (such as a water-sewer district) to provide this service rather than a general purpose government (city or county with land use authority) . However, limitations in the current RCW 57 statute are preventing CRWWD from moving forward to fill this need and provide the public benefits. Specific challenges relate to service area definition/expansion, annexation/assumption process with cities, and elected representation issues.
6. What your entity would like to see accomplished by the study group :
Develop an effective regional water/wastewater utility statute/structure with all required empowerments or amend the existing RCW 57 framework to support a fully empowered regional water/sewer provider in the context of a water-sewer district.
7. Other input/ideas you'd like to share with the others at the July 9 meeting

Rick Hughes,
Chief Administrative Officer, LOTT Alliance

1. Name of Your Organization/Entity-
LOTT Clean Water Alliance;
2. Members/Who you Serve-
Cities of Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater, and County of Thurston. Roughly 90,000 population base.
3. What services you provide-
Regional wastewater and reclaimed water services.
4. Your legal status-
Non-profit corporation formed under the Interlocal Cooperation Act;
5. What challenges you have faced/challenges you'd like to see addressed-
Challenges include public entity status, applicable procurement laws, treasurer functions, condemnation authority, and statutory language that does not quite fit our needs (e.g., use of word "ordinance" when we can't approve ordinances.)
6. What your entity would like to see accomplished by the study group-
A plan to address the foregoing needs.
7. Other input/ideas you'd like to share with the others at the July 9 meeting-
No other ideas at the present time.

John Weidenfeller
General Manager, Thurston Public Utility District (PUD)

1. Name of Your Organization/Entity
Public Utility District No. 1 of Thurston County
2. Members/Who you Serve
Water System Rate Payers in 155 water systems in five counties; primarily Thurston, Pierce and Lewis Counties; over 3,150 customers. Our largest system has 1308 connections and our smallest 4 connections. Additionally, serve as a satellite management agency for between 10 & 13 systems over the past two years, 750-1,000 connections.
3. What services you provide
Water only.
4. Your legal status
Municipal Corporation under RCW title 54
5. What challenges you have faced/challenges you'd like to see addressed
Exempt wells in our service areas continue to be a problem.
6. What your entity would like to see accomplished by the study group –
Unknown
7. Other input/ideas you'd like to share with the others at the July 9 meeting –
None at this time.

**Chuck Clarke, CEO
Cascade Water Alliance**

1. Name of Your Organization/Entity **Cascade Water Alliance**
2. Members/Who you Serve **Cities of Bellevue, Kirkland, Issaquah, Redmond. Tukwila and Covington Water District, Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District and Skyway Water and Sewer District.**
3. What services you provide **Provide water to members who provide water to their 400,000 residents and 22,000 businesses. This includes conservation support and services.**
4. Your legal status **Watershed Management Partnership**
5. What challenges you have faced/challenges you'd like to see addressed

Cascade Water Alliance (Cascade) was created in 1999 as an instrumentality of its members, all of which are cities or special purpose districts of the State of Washington. It was created as a non-profit corporation under the authority of the Interlocal Cooperation Act, chapter 39.34 RCW, and the Nonprofit Miscellaneous and Mutual Corporation Act, chapter 24.06 RCW. It had reviewed several organizational models and, at the time of its inception, the non-profit corporation seemed the most available and acceptable, despite potential issues. Cascade exercises certain governmental functions on members' behalf to plan, develop, and operate a water supply system and regional assets that will meet its members' current and future drinking water needs. However, Cascade did not have bonding authority or power of eminent domain, which had to be added legislatively later. Issues still arise with interlocal agreements, franchise agreements, contracting, grants, procurement, risk management, insurance, financing, taxes, governing, surplus property, planning and permitting,

6. What your entity would like to see accomplished by the study group **Cascade would like to attain certainty of the powers and authorities for it and similar entities that are critical to fulfilling essential public purposes in an effective and efficient manner. We don't want to be constantly asked "what are you" by entities with whom who need to do business. The goal would be to reach a municipal status that is readily understood and accepted by others.**
7. Other input/ideas you'd like to share with the others at the July 9 meeting **By working together, all similar entities could recommend legislation to address our similar concerns to make our service provision easier, better and more efficient for our ratepayers.**